

Appl. No. 09/540,166  
Amdt. Dated 10/26//2004  
Reply to Office Action of 07/29/2004

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed July 29, 2004. In the Office Action, claims 3-7, 10-15, and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Herein, claims 4 and 18 have been placed into independent form to include the limitations of claims 3 and 15, respectively. Claim 10 has been amended to include limitations from dependent claim 11. Claims 3, 11, 15, 23 and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 3, 5, 10, 12, 15 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldshlag (USP 5,136,695) in view of Szamrej (USP 5,990,852). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Goldshlag nor Szamrej, alone or in combination, describe or suggest division of the image frame into tiles representing two-dimensional regions of the image frame and storage of *each of the tiles in a different, separate memory page*. Emphasis added. These limitations are set forth in pending independent claims 4, 10 and 18. Withdrawal of the outstanding § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 11, 18, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldshlag in view of Szamrej and Broemmelsiek (USP 5,574,836). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Broemmelsiek does not teach dividing the image frame into tiles where each tile is stored in one separate memory page. *See paragraph 6 of the Office Action*. Instead, the teachings of Broemmelsiek generally mention the storage of tiles in read-writable RAM but does not suggest the separate storage into memory pages. As a result, Applicants respectfully request that independent claims 4, 10 and 18 are now in condition for allowance as well as the allowability of those claims dependent thereon.

With respect to the rejection of claims 6, 13, 19, and claims 7, 14 and 20, Applicants traverse the rejections. However, based on the allowability of independent claims 4, 10 and 18, Applicants believe that further discussions regarding the allowability of these claims is moot. Applicants reserve the right to traverse these rejections through the Appeal process in the event that a Notice of Allowance is not issued.

Appl. No. 09/540,166  
Amdt. Dated 10/26//2004  
Reply to Office Action of 07/29/2004

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 26, 2004

By

  
William W. Schaal

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

**MAILING**

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service  
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 10/26/2004

**FACSIMILE**

☒ Transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and  
Trademark Office.

  
Susan McFarlane

10/26/2004

Date